

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/022,102	12/18/2001	Alan W. Peters	W9003-04	4840	
75	590 11/20/2002				
	Beverly J. Artale		EXAMINER		
W. R. Grace & CoConn.			YILDIRIM	YILDIRIM, BEKIR L	
Patent Dept. 7500 Grace Dri				,	
Columbia, MD	· =		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
0014111014, 1112	21017 1050		1764	<u> </u>	
			DATE MAILED: 11/20/2002	3	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		S
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/022,102	PETERS ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit
	Bekir L. YILDIRIM	1764
Th MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with a	th correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu. - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3) of will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS ute, cause the application to become ABANI	be timely filed O) days will be considered timely. Forom the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ 1	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under		
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are pending in the application		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr	rawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and Application Papers	or election requirement.	
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to t	•	
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	= ' '	• •
If approved, corrected drawings are required in r		
12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received in Appl	ication No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International E* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	-
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	stic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language p 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes 	• •	
Attachment(s)		

4) 🔲	Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)
5) 🗍	Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3)	Information Disclosure	Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)

		Other:	
٦١.		Other	
J,	-	Outer.	

Art Unit: 1764

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude"/granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 2. Claims 1-18 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6, 165,933. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are directed to essentially the same subject matter varying in merely the scope of the claims, i.e. broadening of the subject matter through the elimination of some of the numerical ranges. It would have been obvious to modify the scope by including or excluding the presence of non-essential components..
- 3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vasalos et al. (USP 4,153,535).

Art Unit: 1764

The reference discloses an FCC catalyst comprising a cracking component and a component, which is deemed based on the totality of the disclosure to function as the combustion promotion component, which comprises the applicant's components including palladium, rare earth metal oxides and alkali metals, e.g. sodium, in overlapping proportions with those of the claims. The combustion component may be in the same particle as the cracking component or in separate particles (see col. 4, lines 18-40, 65-68; col. 5, lines 1-17, 35-43; col. 8, lines 13-28; col. 14, lines 32-61).

It is acknowledged that the reference does not disclose the exact amount ranges in the applicant's claims and that the reference does not disclose the specific combinations disclosed in the claims. The invention as a whole however would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art because the selection of a combination from the limited number of combinations disclosed in the reference, or the determination of the workable range of the metal components would have been within the ordinary skill. See In re Aller, Lacey, and Hall, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955) In re In re Swain et al., 33 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 1250, 1250, 156 F.2d 239, 70 USPQ 412; Minnesota Mining and Mfg. Co. v. Coe, 69 App. D.C. 217, 99 F.2d 986, 38 USPQ 213; Allen et al. v. Coe, 77 App. D. C. 324, 135 F.2d 11, 57 USPQ 136.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bekir L. YILDIRIM whose telephone number is (703) 308-3586. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:30-8:00 (alternating Mondays off).

Page 3

Art Unit: 1764

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (703) 308-4311. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3599 for regular communications and (703) 872-9467 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-0611.

BLY

November 18, 2002

Primary Examiner